

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,805	12/28/2001	James Martin Kaun	KCC-16,044	6953
35844 75	590 01/26/2005	EXAMINER		
PAULEY PETERSEN & ERICKSON 2800 WEST HIGGINS ROAD HOFFMAN ESTATES, IL 60195			KIDWELL, MICHELE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3761	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/032,805	KAUN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michele Kidwell	3761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover she t with the	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period working the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 No	ovember 2004.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-100 is/are pending in the application	l.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>73-89 and 100</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-72 and 90-99</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 May 2002</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)		(PTO 442)				
) Unterview Summary (PTO-413) ) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/9/03:5/28/02		atent Application (PTO-152)				
D. A. L. S. L. S. L. S. M.						

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Claims 73 – 89 and 100 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on November 8, 2004.

The applicant states in the reply filed on November 8, 2004 that claims 1 – 72 and 90 – 99 are readable on the elected species. The applicant has failed to include claim 100, or list the claim as withdrawn in the claims section. The examiner presumes that claim 100 is also nonelected since the applicant has not included the claim in the list of claims as being readable on the elected species and since claim 100 is dependent upon nonelected claim 73.

## **Drawings**

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the liquid impermeable body side liner must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

Art Unit: 3761

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 – 40 and 90 – 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a liquid pervious topsheet, does not reasonably provide enablement for a liquid impermeable body side liner as claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/032,805

Art Unit: 3761

The specification supports a body side liner that is constructed to be liquid pervious (page 16, lines 1-2). However, independent claim 1 recites a liquid impermeable body side liner. The specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a liquid impermeable body side liner as claimed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 41 – 42, 44 – 46, 48 – 72 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0 748 894.

With reference to claims 41, 42, 53 – 56, 68 – 72 and 99, EP 0 748 894 (hereinafter '894) discloses an absorbent article in a variety of configurations including diapers, sanitary napkins, etc. including a liquid permeable body side liner, a containment tissue adjacent to the body side liner comprising a fiber matrix, which may comprise a variety of fibers, and at least one treated region wherein a hydrophobic agent is applied to the fiber matrix in the fiber matrix in the at least one treated region, an absorbent core adjacent the containment tissue and a substantially liquid impermeable outer cover adjacent to the absorbent core as set forth on page 2, line 8 to page 3, line 48. The treated region is a predetermined pattern as shown in the figures, and the agent (comprising a compound from the selected group) is applied as claimed.

Art Unit: 3761

The absorbent article would inherently have the claimed visual contrast between the fiber matrix and the treated region when wetted due the difference in the composition structure. See page 3, line 56 to page 4, line 33.

With reference to claims 44 - 46, 48 - 52, 57 - 67 and 92 - 98, the claimed limitations are considered product by process limitations and only the end structure of the article is given patentable weight. '894 discloses the end structure that the product by process limitation results in. The applicant is reminded that:

"[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 43 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 748 894.

The difference between '894 and claims 43 and 47 is the provision that the containment tissue comprises a specific tissue ply.

Art Unit: 3761

Absent a critical teaching and/or unexpected result, the examiner contends that the claimed limitation is an obvious matter of design choice that does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele Kidwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30am - 2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Schwartz can be reached on 571-272-4390. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michele Kidwell
Examiner
Art Unit 3761